

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

GEORGIA M. BROWN,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case Number 16-10618

Honorable David M. Lawson

UNITED HEALTH GROUP — OPTUM
DIVISION,

Defendant.

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION REQUESTING
PRESERVATION OF THE RECORD AND FOR OTHER RELIEF**

This matter is before the Court on the plaintiff’s motion “to allow the filings in this case to remain intact.” On February 19, 2016, the plaintiff filed her complaint alleging that she was subjected to unlawful race-related discrimination and retaliation. On January 16, 2018, after receiving no objections from the plaintiff, the Court adopted a recommendation by the assigned magistrate judge and entered a judgment of dismissal.

The plaintiff filed an untimely notice of appeal on March 7, 2018. The court of appeals dismissed the appeal for want of jurisdiction in June 2018. More than five years later, on December 13, 2023, the plaintiff filed a motion seeking “case reevaluation based on newly discovered evidence.” The Court denied that motion and also subsequently denied two more motions by the plaintiff seeking reconsideration of the dismissal ruling.

More than six years after the file was closed, the plaintiff began periodically submitting a series of papers including a “response” to several of the Court’s orders, a “notice of additional evidence,” an “addendum” to other filings, and several “complaints” and “requests.” The Court observed that the matter had been closed for several years, and that no purpose was served by

entertaining the repetitive and impertinent filings, and the Court therefore directed the Clerk of Court to strike the post-judgment filings.

On March 20, 2024, the plaintiff filed a motion styled as a request “to allow the filings in this case to remain intact,” on the ground that a “review” of the record will “confirm” that the plaintiff’s counsel was negligent in the handling of the case and that relief from the judgment of dismissal is warranted under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(6). The Court previously denied the plaintiff’s motion for relief from judgment, two motions for reconsideration, and a motion seeking further post-judgment relief on substantially the same grounds as the previous two motions. *See Orders Denying Post-Judgment Motions*, ECF No. 64, 68, 75. The substance of the present motion merely reiterates the same arguments that the Court considered and rejected when it denied the earlier motions. The plaintiff has not established any legal or equitable grounds for setting aside the final judgment of dismissal. Moreover, the plaintiff’s grievances against her lawyer’s handling of the case sound in legal malpractice, but this is not a malpractice action, and even if the plaintiff properly had presented such a claim under the applicable state law, the plaintiff has not established that the Court would have subject matter jurisdiction to address it.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that the plaintiff’s motion to preserve the record and for other relief (ECF No. 76) is **DENIED** for lack of merit in the grounds presented.

s/David M. Lawson
DAVID M. LAWSON
United States District Judge

Dated: April 2, 2024